

to consider the following nominations on the Executive Calendar: Nos. 276, 280, 283, 284 and 285.

I further ask unanimous consent that the nominations be confirmed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, any statements relating to the nominations appear in the RECORD, and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate then return to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations were considered and confirmed as follows:

UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON
PUBLIC DIPLOMACY

Harold C. Pachios, of Maine, to be a Member of the United States Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy for a term expiring July 1, 1999.

UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON
PUBLIC DIPLOMACY

Paula Dobriansky, of Maryland, to be a Member of the United States Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy for a term expiring July 1, 1998.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

R. Nicholas Burns, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Greece.

Tom McDonald, of Ohio, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Zimbabwe.

Mark Robert Parris, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Turkey.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will return to legislative session.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, OCTOBER
30, 1997

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today it stand in adjournment until the hour of 10 a.m. on Thursday, October 30. I further ask that on Thursday, immediately following the prayer, the routine requests through the morning hour be granted. As in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate immediately proceed to executive session for the consideration of Calendar No. 324, Judge Siragusa, of New York, and the time between then and 10:30 a.m. be equally divided between the chairman and ranking member.

I further ask consent that at 10:30 the Senate proceed to vote on the confirmation of the nomination, and immediately following that vote the notification of the President, and upon resumption of legislative session there be a period of morning business until the hour of 12 noon with Senators to speak up to 5 minutes each with the following exceptions:

Senator THOMAS for up to 30 minutes; Senator DASCHLE, or his designee, for up to 30 minutes.

I further ask unanimous consent that at 12 noon the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. 1292 regarding the line-item veto matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE
CALENDAR—S. 1173

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that S. 1173 be placed back on the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, tomorrow, following the 10:30 vote, there will be a period of morning business until 12 noon.

The Senate will begin consideration of S. 1292, a bill disapproving the cancellations transmitted by the President on October 6. The measure has a 10-hour statutory time limitation. However, it is the hope of the majority leader that much of that time may be yielded.

The Senate may also consider and complete action on any or all of the following items: the District of Columbia appropriations bill, the FDA reform conference report, the Amtrak strike resolution, the intelligence authorization conference report, and any additional legislation or executive items that can be cleared.

I also remind all Senators that under rule XXII they have until 1 p.m. on Thursday in order to file timely amendments to H.R. 2646, the A-plus education savings account bill.

Needless to say, all Senators should expect rollcall votes throughout Thursday's session of the Senate.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I now ask that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order following the remarks of Senator LEVIN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. COLLINS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. I thank the Chair and my good friend from Vermont.

NATO ENLARGEMENT

Mr. LEVIN. Madam President, I rise this evening to discuss an issue that relates to NATO enlargement that I believe merits careful consideration by the Senate at this early stage of the ratification process.

Enlargement of the Alliance is based upon Article 10 of the North Atlantic Treaty, also known as the Washington

Treaty, which states in pertinent part as follows:

The parties may, by unanimous agreement, invite any other European state in a position to further the principles of this Treaty and to contribute to the security of the North Atlantic area to accede to this treaty.

So Article 10 sets up two conditions for Alliance membership. One, to further the principles of the Treaty, and, two, to contribute to the security of the North Atlantic area.

Madam President, the principal focus of the Senate and expert commentators thus far has been to examine whether the accession of Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic will contribute to European security. That is the second condition. And that is surely an appropriate focus.

For instance, one of my first concerns was the impact that these additions would have on democratization and movement to a market economy in Russia, which I believe has a major bearing on European security. Those concerns have been greatly ameliorated by the NATO-Russia Founding Act and other NATO initiatives. But we also need to be aware of the other condition of Article 10; namely, to further the principles of the Washington Treaty.

Now, those principles are summed up in the preamble which reads as follows:

The Parties to this Treaty reaffirm their faith in the purposes and principle of the Charter of the United Nations and their desire to live in peace with all peoples and all governments.

They are determined to safeguard the freedom, common heritage and civilization of their peoples, founded on the principles of democracy, individual liberty, and the rule of law.

They seek to promote stability and well-being in the North Atlantic area.

They are resolved to unite their efforts for collective defense and for the preservation of peace and security.

Those are the principles in the preamble to the NATO Treaty.

In the April 23 testimony of Secretary of State Albright and Secretary of Defense Cohen before the Armed Services Committee that kicked off the Senate ratification process, my first question to Secretary Albright dealt with this issue. I asked her to list the criteria which will be applied in judging the applications for membership of the various countries.

Secretary Albright responded as follows:

Senator LEVIN, what we are doing is looking at a general set of criteria that fit into some of the comments that I made in my statement, as did Secretary Cohen. That is, we are interested in countries, first of all, that can be active contributors to the Alliance. This is not a way of just trying to give gifts to countries. This is the world's strongest military alliance, and members have to be capable of pulling their weight in it.

And she continued:

We are looking at democracies, at free market systems. We are looking at the way that countries treat their minorities, their attitude toward human rights. We are looking to make sure that there is civilian control over the military, generally looking at

the ways that they are approaching the post-cold war world and their sense of responsibility toward their own populations.

She continued:

So in broadest terms, our criteria are, first of all, their ability to contribute to this foremost alliance, so that the alliance itself is never diluted; and, second, their bona fides in terms of being functioning democracies with market systems that respect their people and where civilian and military relationships are the kind that we believe are pursuant to those ends.

Madam President, I believe that these are appropriate criteria for judging the suitability of countries for admission to the NATO Alliance. Additionally—and this is my point this evening—I believe that they are appropriate criteria for continued membership in the Alliance. In other words, I believe that the criteria which are used to judge a country's suitability for membership should also remain applicable during its membership, and that if a country fails to live up to those criteria after becoming a member of NATO, that a process should be available whereby that country's membership can be suspended until it can once again meet those criteria.

During the cold war, when the Warsaw Pact posed a major threat to NATO, the emphasis understandably was on the military contribution that NATO members brought to the Alliance. That has changed, however, in the post-cold-war period. There is no current major threat to NATO member countries, and the rationale for enlargement of the Alliance in the present environment, as the Alliance's own September 1995 "Study on NATO Enlargement" makes clear, is different than it was during the cold-war period. Chapter 1 of the NATO study entitled "Purposes of Enlargement" list the following as the first of seven ways in which enlargement will contribute to enhanced stability and security for all countries in the Euro-Atlantic area as:

Encouraging and supporting democratic reforms, including civilian and democratic control over the military.

Similarly, in listing 13 criteria for possible new Alliance members, chapter 5 of the NATO study lists the following as the very first criterion:

Conform to basic principles embodied in the Washington Treaty: democracy, individual liberty and the rule of law.

I have reviewed several collective security treaties to which the United States is a party. In the course of that review, I discovered a number of relevant provisions; for instance, the Charter of the Organization of American States, the world's oldest regional organization. While not as widely celebrated as some of the other charters, nonetheless all of the countries in the Americas but one are today democratic, and it should come as no surprise, then, although the event received virtually no publicity, that on September 25, with the ratification by Venezuela of the Protocol of Washington, the OAS Charter was amended to provide for the suspension of any

member country if that country's democratically elected government is brought down by force. The suspension requires the vote of two-thirds of the member states. So in the OAS there is a way of suspending a member who no longer complies with the criteria for membership in the OAS.

In the United Nations Charter, for instance, it provides in Article 5 that a member against which preventive or enforcement action has been taken by the Security Council may be suspended from the exercise of the rights and privileges of membership. Moreover, Article 6 of the United Nations Charter provides that a member who has persistently violated the principles of the Charter may, indeed, be expelled from the United Nations.

When we review the Washington Treaty that created NATO, we see that it has a provision, article 13, which enables a NATO member to cease to be a party 1 year after notice has been given by it, but the treaty does not contain any provision or process for the suspension of a member nation. And, I think that it should. Specifically, I believe that the NATO treaty should provide for a mechanism to suspend the membership of a NATO member if that member no longer adheres to the principles of the Washington Treaty. Like the recent amendment to the Charter of the Organization of American States, the suspension of a NATO member, I believe, should require the affirmative vote of two-thirds of the members of NATO.

I want to quickly add, this proposal that we add a suspension provision to the NATO Charter is not aimed at any of the current member countries. It is not aimed at Poland or Hungary or the Czech Republic. It is not aimed at any of the nine other members that sought NATO membership or any other nations that may be contemplating seeking membership in NATO in the future. It is simply a mechanism which is needed in any collective security agreement to assure that if a member of that collective security pact no longer adheres to the fundamental principles which bind that pact, that the other members should have a mechanism to suspend the country which is no longer adhering to the fundamental principles.

At the Armed Services Committee's hearing with Secretaries Albright and Cohen, I listed several major issues that the Senate would have to consider in the course of our examination of the wisdom of NATO enlargement. One of those issues was, "Should the United States consider the security of Central European nations one of our Nation's vital interests, so that we would go to war if their security is threatened?"

That is not the only issue, but it is a central issue. And I, for one, am not ready to put the lives of American youth at risk for a nation unless that nation adheres to the principles of the Washington Treaty: democracy, individual liberty, and the rule of law. If

there is a nation in NATO now or that might be added later that no longer adheres to those fundamental principles, then I believe there should be a mechanism in NATO to suspend that country so that we are not bound collectively to go to the defense of a nation that doesn't adhere to the fundamental principles which bind NATO.

Accordingly, I believe that the Senate should add a condition to its ratification of the accession of new members and that condition be that the North Atlantic Treaty be amended to enable NATO to suspend one of its members on the affirmative two-thirds vote of the NATO countries.

I thank the Chair for her patience tonight. I don't think any motion or other action on my part is appropriate. So I simply yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow morning.

Thereupon, at 6:20 p.m., the Senate adjourned until Thursday, October 30, 1997, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 29, 1997:

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. DAVID R. IRVINE, 0000

IN THE COAST GUARD

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR APPOINTMENT AS A PERMANENT REGULAR OFFICER IN THE U.S. COAST GUARD IN THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 14, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 211:

To be lieutenant (junior grade)

WHITNEY L. YELLE, 0000

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE U.S. NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

MATTHEW B. AARON, 0000
TODD A. ABLER, 0000
CHARLES E. ADAMS, 0000
CHRISTOPHER A. ADAMS, 0000
DAVID J. ADAMS, 0000
JEFFREY D. ADAMS, 0000
TAMMY M. ADAMS, 0000
GLENN R. ALLEN, 0000
ROBERT J. ALLEN, 0000
LEE K. ALLRED, 0000
JUAN ALVAREZ, 0000
STEPHEN M. ANDERJACK, 0000
DOUGLAS J. ANDERSON, 0000
ERIC B. ANDERSON, 0000
MARK S. ANDERSON, 0000
MILTON D. ANDERSON, 0000
WILLIAM H. ANDERSON, 0000
CHRISTOPHER P. ANKLAM, 0000
MITCHELL APPEL, 0000
LAYNE M. K. ARAKI, 0000
CHRISTOPHER L. ARCHUT, 0000
KEITH M. ARMISTEAD, 0000
PETER S. ASBY, JR., 0000
ROGER A. ASCHBRENNER, 0000
MARK R. ATWOOD, 0000
JEFFREY G. AUSTIN, 0000
LISA A. AVILA, 0000
HERMAN T. K. AWAI, 0000
ROBERT D. AZEVEDO, 0000
BRUCE G. BACHAND, 0000
DANIEL K. BAGCON, JR., 0000
DANIEL K. BAGGETT, 0000
VERNON E. BAGLEY, 0000
KEVIN W. BAILEY, 0000